From:

Lorie Fowlke

To:

mlivingston; mlivingston@utah.gov

Date: Subject: 6/26/2008 10:13 AM

Fwd: 10-Digit Dialing

Ms. Livingston:

Can you please advise me if this gentleman's perception of things described herein is accurate? If so, I would agree with his point of view and wonder why the Commission is going against popular opinion on this issue? Sincerely,

Lorie D. Fowlke Representative District 59 Orem, Utah

>>> "Ken Smith"

6/25/2008 11:12 AM >>>

Dear Legislators,

I am writing to you as a private citizen and not as a representative of any political party or religious denomination.

As you may be aware, the Utah Public Service Commission is attempting to add a new area code to the same geographical area now covered by area code 801. They refer to this as an overlay, in which both area codes will be placed in the same geographical area. In my opinion, this will be a great source of inconvenience.

Once this is put in place, you and I will have to dial 10 digits in order to make even a local call. This is because even though you may retain the 801 area code, your new neighbor who moves in down the street may be given the new 385 area code. To me, this is an outrage. It seems like a very foolish decision that will result in delays, confusion, and frustration. The other option they have is to simply split the area now covered by 801, let part of that area keep the 801 area code, and give the new area code to the other part. This seems like the rational way to go. Salt Lake County would keep the 801 area code, while Morgan, Davis, Weber, and Utah counties would get a new area code. Personally, I don't mind getting a new area code if it means I can retain the 7-digit dialing for local calls.

I understand that the reason they made this decision is that some businesses complained that, if given a new area code, they will have to undergo the expense of printing new stationery and business cards. Well, with the overlay method, all church directories, school directories, employee directories, government directories, and telephone books will also have to be reprinted to show each individual's area code. This will be a great expense to these groups and is not necessary when all members live within one area code. It seems that the PSC has caved in to pressure from special interest groups at the expense of many thousands of ordinary people.

Last year, although I was not aware of this, the PSC asked for public comments about this proposal. During the brief window of time during which the PSC said it was open to public comments, every comment received opposed the overlay method. Yet, the PSC went ahead and chose the overlay method anyway.

Additional comments have been made since the first of this year. It seems that many other people were also not aware of this proposal until their telephone company recently put a notice in with the phone bill explaining what is about to happen. These notifications from telephone companies have generated a lot of anger and negative comments from the public. A large number of your constituents are no doubt upset by this as well.

If you look at the PSC web site (www.psc.utah.gov">), you will find that many of these comments have been posted there. The vast majority of comments are extremely negative about this proposal and are demanding that the PSC revert to the "split" method of adding the new area code rather than the "overlay" method.

This decision was made by unelected bureaucrats with apparent disregard for the preferences of the majority of the people.

I know that we must pick our battles and I believe this battle can and should be won. It is not too late for the PSC to reverse this bad decision. If you agree with me that this decision must not stand, that we must be allowed to retain 7-digit dialing, then I urge you to contact the PSC and voice your complaint. If you call the PSC, they will tell you to email your comments to Merilee Livingston at mlivingston@utah.gov You can also email John Harvey at jsharvey@utah.gov (these are members of the PSC staff).

I will appreciate your comments on this matter.

Thank you for your support,

Ken Smith